arXiv:1110.0333v1 [math.FA] 3 Oct 2011

On the $\varkappa$th root of a Stieltjes moment sequence

Jan Stochel and Jerzy Bartłomiej Stochel

ABSTRACT. Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ whose $\varkappa$th roots $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are Stieltjes moment sequences are studied ($\varkappa$ is a fixed integer greater than or equal to 2). A formula connecting the closed supports of representing measures of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is established. The relationship between the holes of the supports of these measures is investigated. The set of all pairs (M, N) of positive integers for which there exists a Stieltjes moment sequence whose square root is a Stieltjes moment sequence and both of them have representing measures supported on subsets of $(0,\infty)$ of cardinality M and N, respectively, is described.

1. Introduction

In [**6, 7, 8**] Horn laid the foundations of the theory of infinitely divisible matrices, kernels and positive definite sequences. Among other things, he described Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ whose all powers $\{a_n^\alpha\}_{n=0}^\infty$ with positive real exponents α are Stieltjes moment sequences (cf. [**8**, Theorem 2.9]). In a recent paper [**15**] we asked the question: for what positive integers M is it true that the square root of a Stieltjes moment sequence $\big\{\alpha_1\vartheta_1^n+\ldots+\alpha_M\vartheta_M^n\big\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is not a Stieltjes moment sequence for all real numbers $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_M>0$ and $0<\vartheta_1<\ldots<\vartheta_M$? We will show that the answer to this question is in the affirmative for[1] $M\in\{2,4\}$, and in the negative for $M\notin\{2,4\}$ (cf. Corollary 8.2).

The present work is motivated by the aforementioned papers (including [**10, 2**]). We will consider Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ whose $\varkappa$th roots $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are Stieltjes moment sequences, where $\varkappa$ is a fixed integer greater than or equal to 2; by the Schur product theorem (see [**12**, p. 14] or [**9**, Theorem 7.5.3]) this is equivalent to considering the $\varkappa$th powers of Stieltjes moment sequences. Under the assumption that $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is determinate, we give a formula for the (closed) support of a representing measure μ of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ written in terms of the support of a representing measure ν of $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (see Theorem 3.3). In Section 5 and 6 we

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 44A60, Secondary 28A99.

Key words and phrases. Stieltjes moment sequence, $\varkappa$th root of a Stieltjes moment sequence, representing measure, support of a measure, hole of a support.

This work was supported by the MNiSzW grant No. NN201 546438 (2010-2013) as well as by the MNiSzW grant No. 10.42004 (the second author).

[1] The case of $M=2$, which was answered in [**15**, Lemma 3.3], immediately implies that Rhoades' square root problem (cf. [**10**, p. 296]) has a negative solution (see [**2**, Theorem 7] for a solution of this problem based on a particular choice of a Hausdorff moment sequence whose representing measure is supported on a two point set).

provide some solutions to the following problem: given a hole of the support of the measure μ, determine the circumstances under which the support of ν has a hole and then localize it (see Theorems 5.3 and 6.3); the converse problem is studied as well (see Theorem 5.1). Some solutions of this problem are written in terms of the parameters ι_{s} and ι_{s}^* that describe, in a sense, the geometry of the hole of the support of μ (see Theorem 6.3). Using the results of Sections 2-6, we construct a variety of examples illustrating the concepts of the paper (see Section 7). In particular, an example of a Stieltjes moment sequence which $\varkappa$th root is a Stieltjes moment sequence for $\varkappa = 2, 4$, but not for $\varkappa = 3$ is furnished (see Example 7.6). We conclude this paper with a description of the set of all pairs (M, N) of positive integers for which there exists a Stieltjes moment sequence whose square root is a Stieltjes moment sequence and both of them have representing measures supported on subsets of $(0, \infty)$ of cardinality M and N, respectively (see Theorem 8.1). The reader is encouraged to refer to [**1, 3, 13, 14**] for the mathematical details of the theory of classical moment problems.

2. Preliminaries

From now on, the fields of real and complex numbers are denoted by $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$, respectively, and $\mathbb{Z}$ stands for the set of all integers. Set $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}\colon x \geqslant 0\}$, $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}\colon n \geqslant 0\}$ and $\mathbb{N} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}\colon n \geqslant 1\}$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z}\colon n \leqslant x\}$ and $\lceil x \rceil = \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z}\colon x \leqslant n\}$. The cardinality of a set X is denoted by $\operatorname{card}(X)$. $X^{\varkappa}$ stands for the $\varkappa$-fold Cartesian product of X by itself. We write $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ for the (closed) support of a regular positive Borel measure μ on a Hausdorff topological space. Given $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we denote by δ_θ the Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$ concentrated at $\{\theta\}$.

A sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be a *Stieltjes moment* sequence if there exists a positive Borel measure[2] μ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that $a_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} x^n \mathrm{d}\,\mu(x)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$; such μ is called a *representing measure* of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$. If a Stieltjes moment sequence has a unique representing measure, we call it *determinate*. Recall that (cf. [**4**])

(2.1) each Stieltjes moment sequence which has a compactly supported representing measure is determinate.

It is well known that if (X, Σ, μ) is a measure space, f is a complex Σ-measurable function on X and $\int_X |f|^r \mathrm{d}\,\mu < \infty$ for some $r \in (0, \infty)$, then the μ-essential supremum of $|f|$ is equal to $\lim_{p\to\infty} \Big(\int_X |f|^p \mathrm{d}\,\mu\Big)^{1/p}$ (cf. [**11**, p. 71]). This implies that

(2.2) if $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence with a representing measure μ, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n^{1/n} = \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu$.

Given an integer $\varkappa \geqslant 2$, we define the continuous mapping $\pi_\varkappa\colon \mathbb{R}_+^\varkappa \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\pi_\varkappa(x_1, \ldots, x_\varkappa) = x_1 \cdots x_\varkappa, \quad x_1, \ldots, x_\varkappa \in \mathbb{R}_+. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let F be a subset of $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varkappa$ be an integer greater than or equal to 2. If F is compact, then $\pi_\varkappa(F^\varkappa)$ is compact. If $0 \notin F$ and F is closed, then $0 \notin \pi_\varkappa(F^\varkappa)$ and $\pi_\varkappa(F^\varkappa)$ is closed.*

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Clearly, it is enough to consider the case when $0 \notin F$ and F is closed. We claim that if $\{(x_1^{(n)}, \ldots, x_\varkappa^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq F^\varkappa$ and the sequence

---

[2] Such μ being finite is automatically regular (see e.g., [**11**, Theorem 2.18]).

$\{\pi_\varkappa(x_1^{(n)}, \ldots, x_\varkappa^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is convergent in $\mathbb{R}_+$, then there exists a subsequence of $\{(x_1^{(n)}, \ldots, x_\varkappa^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ which is convergent in $F^\varkappa$.

First note that the sequence $\{x_j^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, \varkappa\}$. Indeed, otherwise, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, \varkappa\}$, $x_k^{(n)} \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Since F is closed and $0 \notin F$, we deduce that $\inf_{n \geqslant 1} x_j^{(n)} > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \varkappa\}$. This implies that the sequence $\{\pi_\varkappa(x_1^{(n)}, \ldots, x_\varkappa^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is unbounded, which is a contradiction. Now using the compactness argument, we establish our claim.

By the assertion just proved, we see that $0 \notin \pi_\varkappa(F^\varkappa)$ and $\pi_\varkappa(F^\varkappa)$ is closed. $\square$

Note that Lemma 2.1 is no longer true if the assumption $0 \notin F$ is dropped. Indeed, if $\varkappa \geqslant 2$ and $F = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \cup \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \ldots\}$, then F is closed, while $\pi_\varkappa(F^\varkappa)$, being equal to the set of all nonnegative rational numbers, is not closed.

3. The relationship between $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\operatorname{supp}\nu$

In the present paper we consider the following situation:

(3.1) $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence with a representing measure μ, $\varkappa$ is an integer greater than or equal to 2 and $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence with a representing measure ν.

We begin by proving the basic relation between μ and ν.

Lemma 3.1. *If* (3.1) *holds and* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *is determinate, then*

$$\mu(E) = \nu^{\otimes\varkappa}(\pi_\varkappa^{-1}(E)) \quad \text{for all Borel subsets } E \text{ of } \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\nu^{\otimes\varkappa}$ *is the* $\varkappa$*-fold product of the measure* ν *by itself and* $\pi_\varkappa$ *is as in* (2.3).

Proof. It follows from Fubini's theorem and [**5**, Theorem C, p. 163] that

$$a_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^\varkappa} (x_1 \cdots x_\varkappa)^n \mathrm{d}\,\nu^{\otimes\varkappa}(x_1, \ldots, x_\varkappa) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} z^n \mathrm{d}\left(\nu^{\otimes\varkappa} \circ \pi_\varkappa^{-1}\right)(z), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

where $\nu^{\otimes\varkappa} \circ \pi_\varkappa^{-1}$ is a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$ given by the right hand side of the equality in (3.2). Thus, by the determinacy of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, the measures μ and $\nu^{\otimes\varkappa} \circ \pi_\varkappa^{-1}$ coincide. $\square$

The following lemma which describes the support of the transport of a measure is surely folklore. For the reader's convenience, we include its proof.

Lemma 3.2. *Let* X *and* Y *be Hausdorff topological spaces,* ρ *and* σ *be regular positive Borel measures on* X *and* Y*, respectively, and* $\phi\colon X \to Y$ *be a continuous mapping such that* $\sigma(E) = \rho(\phi^{-1}(E))$ *for all Borel subsets* E *of* Y*. Then*

$$\operatorname{supp}\sigma = \overline{\phi(\operatorname{supp}\rho)}.$$

Proof. We begin by showing that $\phi(\operatorname{supp}\rho) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\sigma$. Take $x \in \operatorname{supp}\rho$. Let V be an open neighbourhood of $\phi(x)$. By the continuity of ϕ, the set $\phi^{-1}(V)$ is an open neighbourhood of x, and thus $\sigma(V) = \rho(\phi^{-1}(V)) > 0$. Since V is an arbitrary open neighbourhood of $\phi(x)$, we get $\phi(x) \in \operatorname{supp}\sigma$.

It remains to show that $Y \setminus \overline{\phi(\operatorname{supp}\rho)} \subseteq Y \setminus \operatorname{supp}\sigma$. Take $y \in Y \setminus \overline{\phi(\operatorname{supp}\rho)}$. Then $V := Y \setminus \overline{\phi(\operatorname{supp}\rho)}$ is an open neighbourhood of y such that $V \cap \phi(\operatorname{supp}\rho) = \varnothing$. This implies that $\phi^{-1}(V) \cap \operatorname{supp}\rho = \varnothing$. Hence $\sigma(V) = \rho(\phi^{-1}(V)) = 0$, which yields $y \in Y \setminus \operatorname{supp}\sigma$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We are now ready to provide a formula connecting $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ with $\operatorname{supp}\nu$.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose* (3.1) *holds and* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *is determinate. Then*

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu = \overline{\pi_\varkappa\big((\operatorname{supp}\nu)^\varkappa\big)}. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, if $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ *is compact or* $0 \notin \operatorname{supp}\nu$*, then* $\operatorname{supp}\mu = \pi_\varkappa\big((\operatorname{supp}\nu)^\varkappa\big)$.

Proof. Applying Lemmata 3.1 and 3.2 and the well known equality $\operatorname{supp}\nu^{\otimes\varkappa} = (\operatorname{supp}\nu)^\varkappa$, we get (3.3). The "moreover" part follows from (3.3) and Lemma 2.1. □

We will show in Example 7.1 that the closure sign in (3.3) cannot be omitted.

Corollary 3.4. *If* (3.1) *holds and* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *is determinate, then*

(i) $\operatorname{supp}\nu \subseteq \sqrt[\varkappa]{\operatorname{supp}\mu}$,
(ii) $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\nu) \leqslant \operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu)$,
(iii) $\sup\operatorname{supp}\nu = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\sup\operatorname{supp}\mu}$.

Proof. Conditions (i) and (iii) follow from Theorem 3.3 (condition (iii) can also be deduced from (2.2)). Condition (ii) is a direct consequence of (i). □

As shown in Example 7.2, inclusion (i) in Corollary 3.4 may be proper. In turn, inequality (ii) in Corollary 3.4 may be strict (however, in view of Theorem 3.3, if $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) = \aleph_0$, then $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\nu) = \operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu)$). In fact, it may happen that $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ is discreet and has only one accumulation point, while $\operatorname{supp}\mu = \mathbb{R}_+$ (cf. Example 7.1).

4. Transforming holes of $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\operatorname{supp}\nu$

Suppose (3.1) holds. In this and the subsequent two sections we will study the relationship between the following two situations:

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu \subseteq [0,\vartheta_1]\cup[\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3] \text{ with } \vartheta_1,\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } 0 \leqslant \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 \leqslant \vartheta_3,$$
$$\operatorname{supp}\nu \subseteq [0,\alpha]\cup[\beta,\gamma] \text{ with } \alpha,\beta,\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } 0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant \gamma.$$

Hereafter we will consider a transformation $(\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3) \to (\alpha,\beta,\gamma)$ between triplets of real numbers satisfying the inequalities $0 \leqslant \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 \leqslant \vartheta_3$ and $0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant \gamma$ which is given by

$$\alpha = \frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}, \quad \beta = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_2} \quad\text{and}\quad \gamma = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}. \tag{4.1}$$

This transformation is well defined (because $(\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3})^\varkappa < (\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3})^\varkappa \leqslant \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}$) and injective, but not surjective. A triplet (α,β,γ) with $0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant \gamma$ is the image of some $(\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3)$ under this transformation if and only if $\alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} < \beta^\varkappa$. If this is the case, then

$$\vartheta_1 = \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1}, \quad \vartheta_2 = \beta^\varkappa \quad\text{and}\quad \vartheta_3 = \gamma^\varkappa.$$

Given real numbers $\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3$ such that $0 \leqslant \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 \leqslant \vartheta_3$, we set

$$\alpha^\dagger = \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}, \quad \beta^\dagger = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_1}. \tag{4.2}$$

The quantities just defined will play an essential role in Theorem 5.3 below. Clearly, if α, β and γ are defined by (4.1), then

$$0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant \gamma,\ \alpha < \alpha^\dagger \leqslant \beta,\ 0 \leqslant \beta^\dagger < \beta \text{ and } \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} < \beta^\varkappa. \tag{4.3}$$

Note also that

$$\alpha^\dagger < \beta \text{ if and only if } \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3.$$

In general, there is no order relationship between $\alpha^\dagger$ and $\beta^\dagger$. Obviously we have

$$\alpha^\dagger < \beta^\dagger \iff \vartheta_2^{\varkappa} < \vartheta_1 \vartheta_3^{\varkappa-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger \iff \vartheta_2^{\varkappa} = \vartheta_1 \vartheta_3^{\varkappa-1}.$$

The reader should be aware of the fact that the quantities α, β, γ, $\alpha^\dagger$ and $\beta^\dagger$ depend not only on $(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3)$ but also on $\varkappa$. Making explicit the dependence on $\varkappa$, we can formulate the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *If* $0 \leqslant \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 \leqslant \vartheta_3 < \infty$, *then*

(i) $\lim_{\varkappa\to\infty} \alpha^\dagger(\varkappa) = \vartheta_2/\vartheta_3$,
(ii) $\lim_{\varkappa\to\infty} \beta^\dagger(\varkappa) = 1$ *provided that* $\vartheta_1 > 0$,
(iii) *if* $\alpha^\dagger(\varkappa) < \beta^\dagger(\varkappa)$ *for some* $\varkappa \geqslant 2$, *then* $\alpha^\dagger(\varkappa') < \beta^\dagger(\varkappa')$ *for all* $\varkappa' \geqslant \varkappa$.

Moreover, if $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3 < \infty$, *then*

(iv) $\alpha^\dagger(\iota_{\mathrm{s}}) < \beta^\dagger(\iota_{\mathrm{s}})$,
(v) *the sequence* $\{\beta^\dagger(\varkappa) - \alpha^\dagger(\varkappa)\}_{\varkappa=\iota_{\mathrm{s}}}^{\infty}$ *is strictly increasing provided that either* $\vartheta_1 \leqslant 1$ *or* $\vartheta_1 > 1$ *and* $\log\vartheta_1 \leqslant \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\log\vartheta_3$,

where

$$\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = \iota_{\mathrm{s}}(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3) := 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_1)}{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_2)} \right\rfloor \geqslant 2. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. The properties (i)-(iv) are easily seen to be true.

(v) Define the function $f\colon [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by $f(x) = \sqrt[x]{\vartheta_1} - \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[x]{\vartheta_3}$ for $x \in [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty)$. It follows from (iv) that

$$\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3} < \sqrt[\iota_{\mathrm{s}}]{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}} \leqslant \sqrt[x]{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}}, \quad x \in [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty). \tag{4.5}$$

Note that

$$-x^2 f'(x) = \sqrt[x]{\vartheta_1}\log\vartheta_1 - \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[x]{\vartheta_3}\log\vartheta_3, \quad x \in [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty). \tag{4.6}$$

If $\vartheta_1 \leqslant 1$, then

$$-x^2 f'(x) \overset{(4.6)}{<} \Big(\sqrt[x]{\vartheta_1} - \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[x]{\vartheta_3}\Big)\log\vartheta_1 \overset{(4.5)}{\leqslant} 0, \quad x \in [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty).$$

In turn, if $\vartheta_1 > 1$ and $\log\vartheta_1 \leqslant \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\log\vartheta_3$, then

$$-x^2 f'(x) \overset{(4.6)}{\leqslant} \Big(\sqrt[x]{\vartheta_1} - \sqrt[x]{\vartheta_3}\Big)\log\vartheta_1 < 0, \quad x \in [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty).$$

Hence, in both cases, $f'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [\iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \infty)$, which implies that f is strictly increasing. Since $f(\varkappa) = \beta^\dagger(\varkappa) - \alpha^\dagger(\varkappa)$ for $\varkappa = 2, 3, \ldots$, the proof is complete. $\square$

Regarding Proposition 4.1 (v), we note that the sequence $\{\beta^\dagger(\varkappa) - \alpha^\dagger(\varkappa)\}_{\varkappa=\iota_{\mathrm{s}}}^{\infty}$ may be strictly decreasing (e.g., consider $\vartheta_1 = 2$, $\vartheta_2 = 5/2$ and $\vartheta_3 = 2 \cdot 10^4$).

5. Relating holes of $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\operatorname{supp}\nu$

Our next goal is to analyze the situation when the support of a representing measure ν of the $\varkappa$th root of a Stieltjes moment sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ has a hole. A natural question arises as to whether the support of a representing measure μ of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ has a hole and what is the relationship between these two holes. We also study the reverse influence.

If a hole of $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ is properly suited to $\operatorname{supp}\nu$, then we can locate the corresponding hole of $\operatorname{supp}\mu$.

Theorem 5.1. *If* (3.1) *holds and* $\nu((\alpha,\beta)) = 0$ *for some* $\alpha,\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant \gamma := \sup\operatorname{supp}\nu < \infty$ *and* $\alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} < \beta^\varkappa$*, then*

(i) $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2)) = 0$ *and* $\vartheta_3 = \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu < \infty$,
(ii) $\alpha \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ *if and only if* $\vartheta_1 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$,
(iii) $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ *if and only if* $\vartheta_2 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$,

where $\vartheta_1 := \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1}$, $\vartheta_2 := \beta^\varkappa$ *and* $\vartheta_3 := \gamma^\varkappa$.

Proof. Employing (2.1) and (2.2), we deduce that the Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate, $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subseteq [0,\gamma^\varkappa]$ and $\gamma^\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. It is also clear that $\operatorname{supp}\nu \subseteq [0,\alpha] \sqcup [\beta,\gamma]$ and $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$.

(i) Take $x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. By Theorem 3.3, there exist $x_1,\ldots,x_\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ such that $x = x_1\cdots x_\varkappa$. If $x_i \in [\beta,\gamma]$ for every $i \in \{1,\ldots,\varkappa\}$, then evidently $x \geqslant \beta^\varkappa = \vartheta_2$. Otherwise, there exists $i_0 \in \{1,\ldots,\varkappa\}$ such that $x_{i_0} \in [0,\alpha]$, and thus

$$x = x_{i_0}\cdot\prod_{j\neq i_0} x_j \leqslant \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} = \vartheta_1.$$

Hence $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subseteq [0,\vartheta_1] \cup [\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3]$, which gives (i).

Now if $\alpha \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ (respectively: $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$), then the fact that $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ enables us to infer from (3.3) that $\vartheta_1 = \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$ (respectively: $\vartheta_2 = \beta^\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$). Therefore, it remains to prove the "if" parts of assertions (ii) and (iii).

(ii) Assume that $\vartheta_1 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. Then, by Theorem 3.3, $\vartheta_1 = x_1\cdots x_\varkappa$ for some $x_1,\ldots,x_\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\alpha \notin \operatorname{supp}\nu$. If $x_i \in [\beta,\gamma]$ for every $i \in \{1,\ldots,\varkappa\}$, then clearly $\vartheta_1 \geqslant \beta^\varkappa = \vartheta_2$, which contradicts the assumption that $\alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} < \beta^\varkappa$. Otherwise, there exists $i_0 \in \{1,\ldots,\varkappa\}$ such that $x_{i_0} \in [0,\alpha]$. As $\alpha \notin \operatorname{supp}\nu$, we must have $x_{i_0} < \alpha$ and so

$$0 < \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} = \vartheta_1 = x_{i_0}\cdot\prod_{j\neq i_0} x_j < \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1},$$

which is a contradiction.

(iii) Assume that $\vartheta_2 = \beta^\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\beta \notin \operatorname{supp}\nu$. Since $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$, we must have $\beta < \gamma$. Clearly, the set $\operatorname{supp}\nu \cap [\beta,\gamma]$ is compact and nonempty. Set $\beta' = \min(\operatorname{supp}\nu \cap [\beta,\gamma])$. Since $\beta \notin \operatorname{supp}\nu$, we get $0 \leqslant \alpha < \beta < \beta' \leqslant \gamma$ and $\nu((\alpha,\beta')) = 0$. Note that

$$\alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} < \beta^\varkappa < \beta'^\varkappa. \tag{5.1}$$

Hence, by (i), applied to the triplet (α,β',γ), we have $\mu((\alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1},\beta'^\varkappa)) = 0$, which together with (5.1) contradicts the fact that $\beta^\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. □

Regarding Theorem 5.1, one might expect that the idea of the proof of (iii) would apply to the proof of (ii) in the case of $\alpha > 0$. However, it may happen that there is no point in $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ lying on the left hand side of α (see (7.4) in Example

7.2), and so this idea could not be applied. In turn, (iii) can be proved in the same manner as (ii). As shown in Example 7.3, the "if" parts of assertions (ii) and (iii) are no longer true if we drop the assumption that $\nu((\alpha,\beta))=0$ (though their "only if" parts are always true).

Remark 5.2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.1, if

$$\alpha' := \begin{cases} \sup([0,\alpha]\cap \sup \nu) & \text{when } [0,\alpha]\cap \sup \nu \neq \varnothing, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\beta' := \inf([\beta,\gamma]\cap \operatorname{supp}\nu),$$

then $0 \leqslant \alpha' \leqslant \alpha$, $\beta \leqslant \beta' \leqslant \gamma$, $\nu((\alpha',\beta'))=0$ and $\alpha'\gamma^{\varkappa-1} < \beta'^{\varkappa}$, which means that the numbers α', β' and γ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 5.1.

Our goal now is to look for holes of $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ that may correspond to a given hole of $\operatorname{supp}\mu$.

Theorem 5.3. *If* (3.1) *holds and* $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2))=0$ *for some* $\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2\in\mathbb{R}$ *such that* $0\leqslant\vartheta_1<\vartheta_2$, *then*

(i) $\nu((\beta^\dagger,\beta))=0$ *provided that* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *is determinate,*
(ii) $\nu((\alpha,\alpha^\dagger))=0$ *provided that* $\vartheta_2\leqslant\vartheta_3:=\sup\operatorname{supp}\mu<\infty$,
(iii) $\nu((\alpha,\beta))=0$ *provided that* $\vartheta_2\leqslant\vartheta_3:=\sup\operatorname{supp}\mu<\infty$ *and any of the following two conditions holds*:
  (iii-a) *either* $\beta^\dagger<\alpha^\dagger$, *or* $\beta^\dagger\leqslant\alpha^\dagger$ *and* $\varkappa\geqslant 3$, *or* $\beta^\dagger=\alpha^\dagger$ *and* $\beta\in\operatorname{supp}\nu$,
  (iii-b) $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha<\alpha^\dagger$ *and* $\beta\in\operatorname{supp}\nu$,

where $\alpha=\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}$, $\beta=\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_2}$, $\gamma=\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}$, $\alpha^\dagger=\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}$ *and* $\beta^\dagger=\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_1}$.

Remark 5.4. Note that if $\varkappa$ is an integer greater than or equal to 2, $0\leqslant\vartheta_1<\vartheta_2\leqslant\vartheta_3:=\sup\operatorname{supp}\mu<\infty$ and $\beta^\dagger\leqslant\alpha^\dagger$, then $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha<\alpha^\dagger$. Indeed, since the case $\vartheta_2=\vartheta_3$ is obvious, we can assume that $\vartheta_2<\vartheta_3$. Then

$$\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}\leqslant\Big(\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\Big)^{\varkappa}<\Big(\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}\Big)^{1+\frac{1}{\varkappa}},$$

which yields $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha<\alpha^\dagger$. It may happen that condition (iii-b) of Theorem 5.3 is satisfied, while condition (iii-a) does not hold (cf. Example 7.2). Moreover, assertion (iii) is no longer true if we drop either the assumption that $\beta\in\operatorname{supp}\nu$ (cf. Example 7.3), or the assumption that $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha<\alpha^\dagger$ (cf. Example 7.4).

Proof of Theorem 5.3. (i) Suppose that, contrary to our claim, there exists $x\in\operatorname{supp}\nu$ such that $\beta^\dagger<x<\beta$. Then, by (3.3), we have $x^\varkappa\in\operatorname{supp}\mu$. This and $\vartheta_1<x^\varkappa<\vartheta_2$ lead to the contradiction that $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2))=0$.

(ii) By (2.1), the Stieltjes moment sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is determinate. Hence, by Corollary 3.4(iii), we have $\gamma=\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}\in\operatorname{supp}\nu$. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\nu((\alpha,\alpha^\dagger))>0$. Then there exists $x\in\operatorname{supp}\nu\cap(\alpha,\alpha^\dagger)$. It follows from (3.3) that $x\gamma^{\varkappa-1}\in\operatorname{supp}\mu$. This and the inequalities

$$\vartheta_1=\alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1}<x\gamma^{\varkappa-1}<\alpha^\dagger\gamma^{\varkappa-1}=\vartheta_2$$

lead to $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2))>0$, which contradicts our assumption that $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2))=0$.

(iii-a) In view of (2.1), $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is determinate. Hence, by (i) and (ii), we have $\nu((\alpha,\alpha^\dagger)\cup(\beta^\dagger,\beta))=0$. So if $\beta^\dagger<\alpha^\dagger$, then $\nu((\alpha,\beta))=0$. Assume now that

$\beta^\dagger = \alpha^\dagger$ and $\varkappa \geqslant 3$. It is enough to show that $\alpha^\dagger \notin \operatorname{supp}\nu$. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\alpha^\dagger \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$. By Corollary 3.4(iii), $\gamma = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3} \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$. This and (3.3) imply that $(\alpha^\dagger)^{\varkappa-1}\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. Since $\varkappa \geqslant 3$ and $\alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger < \beta \leqslant \gamma$, we have

$$\vartheta_1 = (\beta^\dagger)^\varkappa = (\alpha^\dagger)^\varkappa < (\alpha^\dagger)^{\varkappa-1}\gamma < \alpha^\dagger\gamma^{\varkappa-1} = \vartheta_2.$$

Hence $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) > 0$, which is a contradiction. Finally, the case of $\beta^\dagger = \alpha^\dagger$ and $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ follows from Remark 5.4 and (iii-b).

(iii-b) Set $\alpha_j = (\frac{\gamma}{\beta})^j\alpha$ and $\alpha_j^\dagger = (\frac{\gamma}{\beta})^j\alpha^\dagger$ for $j = 0, \ldots, \varkappa - 1$. Note that

$$\alpha_j < \alpha_j^\dagger \quad \text{for } j = 0, \ldots, \varkappa - 1, \text{ and } \quad \alpha_0 = \alpha < \beta = \alpha_{\varkappa-1}^\dagger. \tag{5.2}$$

We claim that

$$\nu((\alpha_j, \alpha_j^\dagger)) = 0, \quad j = 0, \ldots, \varkappa - 1. \tag{5.3}$$

Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\nu((\alpha_j, \alpha_j^\dagger)) > 0$ for some $j \in \{0, \ldots, \varkappa - 1\}$. Then there exists $x \in (\alpha_j, \alpha_j^\dagger) \cap \operatorname{supp}\nu$. By Corollary 3.4(iii), $\gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$. Since $\beta, \gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$, we infer from (3.3) that $x\beta^j\gamma^{\varkappa-1-j} \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. Noting that

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta_1 = \alpha\gamma^{\varkappa-1} &= \Big(\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\Big)^j\alpha\beta^j\gamma^{\varkappa-1-j} = \alpha_j\beta^j\gamma^{\varkappa-1-j} \\ &< x\beta^j\gamma^{\varkappa-1-j} < \alpha_j^\dagger\beta^j\gamma^{\varkappa-1-j} = \Big(\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\Big)^j\alpha^\dagger\beta^j\gamma^{\varkappa-1-j} = \alpha^\dagger\gamma^{\varkappa-1} = \vartheta_2,\end{aligned}$$

we get $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) > 0$, in contradiction with our assumption that $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$.

The inequality $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha < \alpha^\dagger$ is easily seen to be equivalent to

$$\alpha_{j+1} < \alpha_j^\dagger, \quad j = 0, \ldots, \varkappa - 2. \tag{5.4}$$

We will show that

$$(\alpha, \beta) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\varkappa-1}(\alpha_j, \alpha_j^\dagger). \tag{5.5}$$

Indeed, assuming that[3] $\vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$, we see that if $x \in (\alpha, \alpha_{\varkappa-1}]$, then $x \in (\alpha_j, \alpha_{j+1}]$ for some $j \in \{0, \ldots, \varkappa - 2\}$. Hence, by (5.4), $x \in (\alpha_j, \alpha_j^\dagger)$. Since, by (5.2), $(\alpha_{\varkappa-1}, \alpha_{\varkappa-1}^\dagger) = (\alpha_{\varkappa-1}, \beta)$, the equality (5.5) is proved.

Combining (5.3) with (5.5), we conclude that $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) = 0$. This completes the proof. □

Regarding Theorem 5.3, we can write the following analogue of Remark 5.2.

Remark 5.5. Suppose that (3.1) holds and $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ are real numbers such that $0 \leqslant \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 \leqslant \vartheta_3 = \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$. Set $\vartheta_1' = \vartheta_1$, $\vartheta_2' = \inf([\vartheta_2, \vartheta_3] \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu)$ and $\vartheta_3' = \vartheta_3$. Then $0 \leqslant \vartheta_1' < \vartheta_2' \leqslant \vartheta_3' = \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\mu((\vartheta_1', \vartheta_2')) = 0$. Let $\alpha, \alpha^\dagger, \beta, \beta^\dagger, \gamma$ (respectively $\alpha', \alpha^{\dagger\prime}, \beta', \beta^{\dagger\prime}, \gamma'$) be numbers attached to $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ (respectively $\vartheta_1', \vartheta_2', \vartheta_3'$) via (4.1) and (4.2). Then $\alpha = \alpha'$, $\alpha^\dagger \leqslant \alpha^{\dagger\prime}$, $\beta \leqslant \beta'$, $\beta^\dagger = \beta^{\dagger\prime}$ and $\gamma = \gamma'$. Hence, if $\beta^\dagger < \alpha^\dagger$ or $\beta^\dagger \leqslant \alpha^\dagger$, then $\beta^\dagger < \alpha^{\dagger\prime}$ or $\beta^\dagger \leqslant \alpha^{\dagger\prime}$ respectively. This means that we can apply Theorem 5.3 to the new system of numbers $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2', \vartheta_3, \alpha, \alpha^{\dagger\prime}, \beta', \beta^\dagger, \gamma$ (note that if $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$, then by Corollary 3.4 (i) we have $\vartheta_2 = \beta^\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$, and so $\vartheta_2' = \vartheta_2$).

---

[3] The case of $\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_3$ is obvious.

Corollary 5.6. *Suppose* (3.1) *holds. Let* $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ *be real numbers such that* $0 \leqslant \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 \leqslant \vartheta_3$ *and let* $\alpha := \frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3} \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}$, $\beta := \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_2}$, $\gamma := \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}$ *and* $\beta^{\dagger} := \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_1}$. *Then the following assertions are valid.*

(i) *If* $\vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$, $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *is determinate and* $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = \mu((\vartheta_2, \vartheta_3)) = 0$, *then* $\nu((\beta^{\dagger}, \beta)) = \nu((\beta, \gamma)) = 0$.

(ii) *If* $\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_3$, $\vartheta_2 = \sup \operatorname{supp} \mu$ *and* $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$, *then* $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) = 0$ *and* $\beta \in \operatorname{supp} \nu$.

(iii) *If* $\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_3$, $\vartheta_1 \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$, $\vartheta_2 = \sup \operatorname{supp} \mu$ *and* $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$, *then* $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) = 0$ *and* $\alpha, \beta \in \operatorname{supp} \nu$.

(iv) *If* $\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_3$, *then the following two conditions are equivalent*:
  (a) $\vartheta_1 \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$, $\vartheta_2 = \sup \operatorname{supp} \mu$ *and* $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$,
  (b) $\alpha \in \operatorname{supp} \nu$, $\beta = \sup \operatorname{supp} \nu$ *and* $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) = 0$.

Proof. (i) Apply Theorem 5.3 (i) to intervals $(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ and $(\vartheta_2, \vartheta_3)$.

(ii) and (iii) These two assertions can be deduced from assertion (ii) of Theorem 5.3, (2.2) and assertions (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 5.1 (because $\beta = \alpha^{\dagger}$).

(iv) Implication (a)$\Rightarrow$(b) can be inferred from (iii) and (2.2). The reverse implication is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.1. $\square$

See Appendix for another proof of the implication (a)$\Rightarrow$(b) of Corollary 5.6 (iv).

We conclude this section by discussing the case when the support of a representing measure of a Stieltjes moment sequence is contained in a closed interval $[\vartheta, \infty)$, $\vartheta > 0$. Note that ϑ corresponds to ϑ_2 in Theorem 5.1.

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose that* (3.1) *holds and* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *is determinate. Then the following assertions are valid.*

(i) *If* $\nu([0, \beta)) = 0$ *for some real number* $\beta > 0$, *then* $\mu([0, \beta^{\varkappa})) = 0$.

(ii) *If* $\mu([0, \vartheta)) = 0$ *for some real number* $\vartheta > 0$, *then* $\nu([0, \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta})) = 0$.

(iii) *If* $\mu([0, \vartheta)) = 0$ *for some real number* $\vartheta > 0$ *such that* $\vartheta \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$, *then* $\nu([0, \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta})) = 0$ *and* $\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta} \in \operatorname{supp} \nu$.

Proof. Assertions (i) and (ii) follow from Theorem 3.3.

(iii) By (ii), we have $\nu([0, \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta})) = 0$, and thus $0 \notin \operatorname{supp} \nu$. It follows from Theorem 3.3 that $\vartheta = x_1 \cdots x_{\varkappa}$ for some $x_1, \ldots, x_{\varkappa} \in \operatorname{supp} \nu$. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta} \notin \operatorname{supp} \nu$. Then $x_j > \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta}$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, \varkappa\}$, and thus $\vartheta = x_1 \cdots x_{\varkappa} > \vartheta$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

6. When is (α, β) a hole of $\operatorname{supp} \nu$?

Before stating a theorem which provides an answer to the above question, we introduce a new parameter ι_{s}^{*} and prove two technical lemmas about the parameters ι_{s} (cf. (4.4)) and ι_{s}^{*}. For real numbers $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ such that $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$, we set

$$\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^{*} = \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^{*}(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3) := 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_2)}{\log(\vartheta_2/\vartheta_1)} \right\rfloor \geqslant 1. \tag{6.1}$$

Note that the following equalities hold for all $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\iota_{\mathrm{s}}(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3) = \iota_{\mathrm{s}}\big(t\vartheta_1, t\vartheta_2, t\vartheta_3\big) \text{ and } \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^{*}(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3) = \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^{*}\big(t\vartheta_1, t\vartheta_2, t\vartheta_3\big).$$

Lemma 6.1. *If* $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ *are such that* $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$, *then the following assertions are valid*:

(i) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 2$ *implies* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^{*} \geqslant 2$,

(ii) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 3$ *implies* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* \in \{1, 2\}$,
(iii) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 3$ *and* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 2$ *if and only if* $\vartheta_1\vartheta_3 = \vartheta_2^2$,
(iv) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant 4$ *implies* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$,
(v) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$ *if and only if* $\vartheta_1\vartheta_3 < \vartheta_2^2$,
(vi) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$ *implies* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant 3$,
(vii) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 2$ *implies* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \in \{2, 3\}$,
(viii) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* \geqslant 3$ *implies* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 2$.

Moreover, for every integer $p \geqslant 2$, *there exist real numbers* $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ *such that* $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$, $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 2$ *and* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = p$.

Proof. Suppose that $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$. First we show that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\iota_{\mathrm{s}} - 2 + r > 0 \text{ and } \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\iota_{\mathrm{s}} - 2 + r} \right\rfloor. \tag{6.2}$$

Indeed, by definition of ι_{s}, there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} - 2 + r > 0$ and $\frac{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_1)}{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_2)} = \iota_{\mathrm{s}} - 1 + r$. This gives us $\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_1} = \big(\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_2}\big)^{\iota_{\mathrm{s}}-1+r}$. As a consequence, we have

$$\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_2} = \Big(\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_1}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\iota_{\mathrm{s}}-2+r}}, \tag{6.3}$$

which yields (6.2).

Conditions (i) to (viii) except for (iii) and (v) can be deduced from (6.2). Condition (iii) follows from (6.2) and (6.3). Clearly, $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$ if and only if $\frac{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_2)}{\log(\vartheta_2/\vartheta_1)} < 1$, or equivalently if and only if $\vartheta_1\vartheta_3 < \vartheta_2^2$, which gives (v).

Now we justify the "moreover" part. Set $\vartheta_3 = 1$. For fixed $\vartheta_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in \{2, 3, \ldots\}$, we define $\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_1^{\frac{2p-1}{2p+1}}$. It is a simple matter to verify that $\vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$, $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 2$ and $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = p$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let* $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ *be real numbers such that* $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$. *Then the following assertions hold*:

(i) *if* $\alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger$ *and* $\varkappa \geqslant 3$, *then* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$,
(ii) *if* $\varkappa = 2$, *then* $\alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger$ *if and only if* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 3$ *and* $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 2$,
(iii) *if* $\varkappa \geqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$, *then* $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha < \alpha^\dagger$,

where α, $\alpha^\dagger$, β, $\beta^\dagger$ *and* γ *are as in* (4.1) *and* (4.2).

Proof. (i) By (4.2), we have

$$\vartheta_2 = \vartheta_3 \sqrt[\varkappa]{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}}. \tag{6.4}$$

Since $\varkappa \geqslant 3$, we get $1 - \frac{2}{\varkappa} > 0$, and thus $\vartheta_1^{1-\frac{2}{\varkappa}} < \vartheta_3^{1-\frac{2}{\varkappa}}$, which together with (6.4) implies that $\vartheta_1\vartheta_3 < \Big(\vartheta_3 \sqrt[\varkappa]{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}}\Big)^2 = \vartheta_2^2$. By Lemma 6.1(v), $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$.

(ii) By (4.2), $\alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger$ if and only if $\vartheta_1\vartheta_3 = \vartheta_2^2$. Applying Lemma 6.1(iii) completes the proof of (ii).

(iii) Since $\varkappa \geqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$, we see that $\varkappa > \frac{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_2)}{\log(\vartheta_2/\vartheta_1)}$. Hence $\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_1} > \big(\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_2}\big)^{\frac{1}{\varkappa}}$, and thus $\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_1} > \big(\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_2}\big)^{1+\frac{1}{\varkappa}}$, which implies that $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha < \alpha^\dagger$. □

Theorem 6.3 below gives sufficient conditions for an interval (α, β) to be a hole of $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ written in terms of the parameters ι_{s} and ι_{s}^*.

Theorem 6.3. *If* (3.1) *holds,* $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2)) = 0$ *for some* $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3 := \sup \operatorname{supp} \mu < \infty$ *and any of the conditions* (i)-(v) *below is satisfied, then* $\nu((\alpha,\beta)) = 0$.

(i) $\varkappa \geqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$ *and* $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$.
(ii) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$ *and* $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$.
(iii) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant 3$ *and* $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$.
(iv) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant 4$.
(v) $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$.

($\alpha, \beta, \iota_{\mathrm{s}}, \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$ *are as in* (4.1), (4.4) *and* (6.1).)

Proof. (i) Apply Lemma 6.2(iii) and Theorem 5.3 (iii-b).

(v) We deal first with the case in which $\vartheta_2 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. We will show that $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$. By (2.1), Corollary 3.4 (iii) and Theorem 3.3, there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$ such that $\vartheta_2 = x_1 \cdots x_\varkappa$. It follows from (4.2) and (4.3) that $\vartheta_2 = \alpha^\dagger \gamma^{\varkappa-1}$ and $0 < \alpha^\dagger, x_1, \ldots, x_\varkappa \leqslant \gamma$. Hence

$$x_j \in [\alpha^\dagger, \gamma], \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, \varkappa\}. \tag{6.5}$$

Note that $x_1 = \cdots = x_\varkappa$. Indeed, otherwise $x_k < x_l$ for some $k \neq l$. Since, by Lemma 6.1(v), $\vartheta_1\vartheta_3 < \vartheta_2^2$, we have

$$\vartheta_2 > x_k^2 \cdot \prod_{j \notin \{k,l\}} x_j = \vartheta_2 \frac{x_k}{x_l} \overset{(6.5)}{\geqslant} \vartheta_2 \frac{\alpha^\dagger}{\gamma} = \frac{\vartheta_2^2}{\vartheta_3} > \vartheta_1. \tag{6.6}$$

Applying Theorem 3.3 we see that $x_k^2 \cdot \prod_{j \notin \{k,l\}} x_j \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$, which together with (6.6) shows that $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2)) > 0$. This leads to a contradiction. Since $x_1 = \cdots = x_\varkappa$, we deduce that $\beta = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_2} = x_1 \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$. Applying (i), we get $\nu((\alpha,\beta)) = 0$.

If $\vartheta_2 \notin \operatorname{supp}\mu$, then we argue as follows. Set $\vartheta_2' = \inf([\vartheta_2, \vartheta_3] \cap \operatorname{supp}\mu)$ and $\beta' = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_2'}$. Then $\beta \leqslant \beta'$ and $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2')) = 0$. If $\vartheta_2' = \vartheta_3$, then by Corollary 5.6(ii) we have $\nu((\alpha,\beta)) \leqslant \nu((\alpha,\beta')) = 0$. Otherwise $\vartheta_2' < \vartheta_3$. Since $1 \leqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2', \vartheta_3) \leqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3) = 1$ and $\vartheta_2' \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$, we may apply the argument from the previous paragraph to $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2', \vartheta_3$. What we obtain is $\nu((\alpha,\beta)) \leqslant \nu((\alpha,\beta')) = 0$.

(iv) Apply (v) and Lemma 6.1(iv).

(ii) If $\varkappa \geqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$, then we may apply (i). Consider the case of $\varkappa < \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$. Then, by $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$, we have $2 \leqslant \varkappa < \iota_{\mathrm{s}}$. Thus, if $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant 4$, then we may apply (iv). It remains to consider the case of $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 3$. Then clearly $\varkappa = 2$. It follows from $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 3$ that $\frac{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_1)}{\log(\vartheta_3/\vartheta_2)} \geqslant 2$, or equivalently that $\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_1} \geqslant (\frac{\vartheta_3}{\vartheta_2})^2$, which is equivalent to $\beta^\dagger \leqslant \alpha^\dagger$. Applying Theorem 5.3 (iii-a) gives $\nu((\alpha,\beta)) = 0$.

(iii) Since, by parts (ii) and (iv) of Lemma 6.1, the inequality $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} \geqslant 3$ implies that $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} > \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$, we can apply (ii). This completes the proof. □

Note that conditions (ii)-(v) of Theorem 6.3 impose no restriction on $\varkappa$, and that Theorem 6.3 is no longer true if any of the assumptions (i)-(v) is dropped (see Example 7.3 for the discussion concerning the assumption $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$, and Example 7.4 for the discussion concerning the remaining assumptions).

Corollary 6.4. *Let* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ *be a Stieltjes moment sequence with a representing measure* μ *such that* $0 < \vartheta_3 := \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu < \infty$. *Suppose* $\mu((\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2)) = 0$ *for some* $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$. *Assume that the set*

$$J := \Big\{\varkappa \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \colon \varkappa \geqslant 2 \text{ and } \big\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\big\}_{n=0}^\infty \text{ is a Stieltjes moment sequence}\Big\} \tag{6.7}$$

is nonempty. If $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$*, then the following conditions are equivalent*:

(i) $\vartheta_2 \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$,

(ii) $\beta(\varkappa) \in \operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa$ *for some* $\varkappa \in J$,

(iii) $\beta(\varkappa) \in \operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa$ *for every* $\varkappa \in J$,

where $\beta(\varkappa) = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_2}$ *and* $\nu_\varkappa$ *is a representing measure of* $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$.

Proof. By (2.2), we have $\gamma(\varkappa) := \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3} = \sup \operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa$ for every $\varkappa \in J$.

(i)⇒(iii) It follows form Theorem 6.3 (v) that $\nu_\varkappa((\alpha(\varkappa), \beta(\varkappa))) = 0$ for every $\varkappa \in J$, where $\alpha(\varkappa) = \frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}$. Hence, by Theorem 5.1 (iii), $\beta(\varkappa) \in \operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa$ for every $\varkappa \in J$.

(iii)⇒(ii) Evident.

(ii)⇒(i) Applying (3.3), we see that $\vartheta_2 = \beta(\varkappa)^\varkappa \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$. □

It is worth mentioning that implication (i)⇒(iii) of Corollary 6.4 is no longer true if we drop the assumption that $\iota_{\mathrm{s}}^* = 1$ (cf. Example 7.3), though the reverse implication is always true. What is more, the set J defined in (6.7) may not be a set of consecutive integers (cf. Example 7.6). As shown in Example 7.3, the set J may contain only one point. It may also happen that $J = \{2, 3, 4, \ldots\}$ (cf. [**8**]).

7. Examples

In this section we gather examples that illustrate the delicate nature of results appearing in Sections 3, 5 and 6. In what follows we adhere to the notation in (4.1), (4.2), (4.4) and (6.1). If $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate Stieltjes moment sequences, then their representing measures will be denoted by μ and ν respectively.

We begin by showing that the closure sign in (3.3) cannot be omitted.

Example 7.1. Let $\varkappa = 2$. For $\tau \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$, we set

$$\sqrt{a_n} = \sum_{j=2}^\infty \frac{1}{2^j (j+\tau)^n} + \sum_{j=2}^\infty \frac{j^n}{\mathrm{e}^{j^2}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{7.1}$$

It is clear that $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are Stieltjes moment sequences, and that $\nu := \sum_{j=2}^\infty 2^{-j} \delta_{\frac{1}{j+\tau}} + \sum_{j=2}^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-j^2} \delta_j$ is a representing measure of $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$. Hence

$$\operatorname{supp} \nu = \{0\} \cup \left\{\ldots, \frac{1}{4+\tau}, \frac{1}{3+\tau}, \frac{1}{2+\tau}\right\} \cup \{2, 3, 4, \ldots\}. \tag{7.2}$$

Now we show that $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a determinate Stieltjes moment sequence. For $n \geqslant 1$, we define the function $f_n \colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by $f_n(x) = x^{2n} \mathrm{e}^{-x^2}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. It is easily seen that f_n is strictly increasing on the interval $[0, \sqrt{n}\,]$ and strictly decreasing on the interval $[\sqrt{n}, \infty)$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{a_{2n}} &\overset{(7.1)}{\leqslant} 1 + \sum_{j=2}^\infty f_n(j) \\ &\leqslant 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor - 1} f_n(j) + \sum_{j=\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor+2}^\infty f_n(j) + f_n(\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor) + f_n(\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor + 1) \\ &\leqslant 1 + \int_0^\infty f_n(x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x + 2 f_n(\sqrt{n}), \quad n \geqslant 4. \end{aligned}$$

By a suitable change of variables, we have

$$\int_0^\infty f_n(x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty x^{n-\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,x \leqslant \int_0^1 x^{n-\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,x + \int_1^\infty x^{n-\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,x$$
$$\leqslant 1 + \int_1^\infty x^{n}\mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,x \leqslant 1 + \int_0^\infty x^{n}\mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{d}\,x = 1 + n!, \quad n \geqslant 1.$$

It is also clear that $f_n(\sqrt{n}) \leqslant n^n$ for all $n \geqslant 1$. Putting all these together yields $\sqrt{a_{2n}} \leqslant 4n^n$ for all $n \geqslant 4$, which implies that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_{2n}^{-1/2n} = \infty$. Hence, by the Carleman criterion (cf. [**13**, Theorem 1.10]), the Stieltjes moment sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is determinate.

We first consider the case of $\tau = 0$. By (7.2), the set $\pi_\varkappa\big((\operatorname{supp}\nu)^\varkappa\big)$ coincides with the set of all nonnegative rational numbers, and so, in view of Theorem 3.3, we have $\operatorname{supp}\mu = \mathbb{R}_+$.

Now suppose that $\tau = 1/2$. It follows from (7.2) that $1 \notin \pi_\varkappa\big((\operatorname{supp}\nu)^\varkappa\big)$. Since $1 = \lim_{j\to\infty}\frac{j}{j+\frac{1}{2}}$, we infer from (3.3) that $1 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$.

As above we verify that the Stieltjes moment sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ given by

$$\sqrt{a_n} = \sum_{j=2}^\infty \frac{1}{2^j(j+\tau)^n} + \sum_{j=2}^\infty \frac{j^n}{\mathrm{e}^j}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \quad \Big(\tau \in \Big\{0, \frac{1}{2}\Big\}\Big),$$

satisfies the inequality $\sqrt{a_n} \leqslant 3n^n$ for all $n \geqslant 2$, which implies that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n^{-1/2n} = \infty$. Hence, by the Carleman criterion (cf. [**13**, Theorem 1.11]), the Stieltjes moment sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is determinate (in fact, it is determinate as a Hamburger moment sequence, cf. [**14**, Corollary 4.5]). Choosing $\tau \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$, we obtain new examples of Stieltjes moment sequences with the required properties.

The next example is related to Corollary 3.4 and Theorems 5.1 and 5.3.

Example 7.2. Set $\varkappa = 3$. Let $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3$ be real numbers such that

$$0 < \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3, \quad \frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3} < \sqrt[3]{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}} < \sqrt[3]{\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}}$$

(e.g., $\vartheta_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{3}}$, $\vartheta_2 = 1$ and $\vartheta_3 = 2$). Then $0 < \alpha < \alpha^\dagger < \beta^\dagger < \beta < \gamma$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^3 &< \alpha^2\beta < \alpha^2\gamma < \alpha\beta^2 < \alpha\beta\gamma \\ &< \alpha\gamma^2 = \vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 = \beta^3 < \beta^2\gamma < \beta\gamma^2 < \gamma^3 = \vartheta_3. \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

Set $a_n = (\alpha^n + \beta^n + \gamma^n)^3$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Clearly $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[3]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate Stieltjes moment sequences. We easily verify that the terms of the sequence (7.3) form the support of μ and that $\operatorname{supp}\nu = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$. Thus $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$, $\{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\mu([0, \vartheta_1)) > 0$, though

$$\nu((\alpha, \beta)) = 0, \ \{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\nu \text{ and } \nu([0, \alpha)) = 0. \tag{7.4}$$

Since $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) = 10$, we see that $\operatorname{supp}\nu \subsetneq \sqrt[\varkappa]{\operatorname{supp}\mu}$. Moreover, if we replace the inequality $\sqrt{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}} < \sqrt[3]{\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}}$ by the stronger one $\sqrt[4]{\frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_3}} < \sqrt[3]{\frac{\vartheta_2}{\vartheta_3}}$ (which is still satisfied by $\vartheta_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{3}}$, $\vartheta_2 = 1$ and $\vartheta_3 = 2$), then $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\alpha < \alpha^\dagger$ and $\beta \in \operatorname{supp}\nu$, though $\beta^\dagger > \alpha^\dagger$.

Example 7.3 below shows that the assumption that one or two endpoints of the interval (α, β) belong to $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ is essential for Theorems 5.1, 5.3 and 6.3 as well as for Corollary 6.4. Moreover, in this example, the set J defined in (6.7) consists only of one point 2.

Example 7.3. Let $\varkappa = 2$, $\vartheta_1 = 1$, $\vartheta_2 = \sqrt{a}$ and $\vartheta_3 = a$ with $a \in (1, \infty)$. Then $\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}$, $\alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger = 1$, $\beta = \sqrt[4]{a}$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{a}$. Set

$$a_n = ((\alpha^\dagger)^n + \gamma^n)^2 = \vartheta_1^n + 2\vartheta_2^n + \vartheta_3^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{7.5}$$

Clearly $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate Stieltjes moment sequences. It follows from (7.5) that $\operatorname{supp} \mu = \{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3\}$ and $\operatorname{supp} \nu = \{\alpha^\dagger, \gamma\}$. Hence $\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha < \alpha^\dagger$, $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) > 0$ and $\alpha, \beta \notin \operatorname{supp} \nu$. Moreover, we have $\iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 3 > 2 = \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*$.

We will show that $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is not a Stieltjes moment sequence for every integer $\varkappa \geqslant 3$. Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence for some integer $\varkappa \geqslant 3$. Denote by $\nu_\varkappa$ the representing measure of $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$. By (2.1) and Corollary 3.4, $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa) < \infty$ and $\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3} = \sup \operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa$. Hence, in view of Theorem 3.3, $\operatorname{supp} \mu = \pi_\varkappa\big((\operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa)^\varkappa\big)$. If $\operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa = \{\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}\}$, then $\operatorname{supp} \mu = \{\vartheta_3\}$, a contradiction. Otherwise, by (3.3), there exists $x \in \operatorname{supp} \nu_\varkappa \cap (0, \sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3})$. Then, by (3.3) again, $x^0\big(\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}\big)^\varkappa, x^1\big(\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}\big)^{\varkappa-1}, \ldots, x^\varkappa\big(\sqrt[\varkappa]{\vartheta_3}\big)^0$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of $\varkappa + 1$ elements of $\operatorname{supp} \mu$. Since $\varkappa + 1 \geqslant 4$, we arrive at a contradiction with $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp} \mu) = 3$.

The subsequent example is related to Theorems 5.3 and 6.3.

Example 7.4. Let $\varkappa = 2$. Set $\vartheta_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, $\vartheta_2 = 1$ and $\vartheta_3 = 9$. Then $\alpha = \frac{1}{6}$, $\alpha^\dagger = \frac{1}{3}$, $\beta^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, $\beta = 1$ and $\gamma = 3$. Set $a_n = (\alpha^n + (\alpha^\dagger)^n + \beta^n + \gamma^n)^2$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. The Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate. It is easily seen that $\operatorname{supp} \mu = \{\frac{1}{36}, \frac{1}{18}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 3, 9\}$, $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$, $\{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \mu$, $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) > 0$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \nu$. Moreover, we have

$$\alpha^\dagger < \beta^\dagger, \quad \frac{\gamma}{\beta}\,\alpha > \alpha^\dagger, \quad \iota_{\mathrm{s}} = 2 < 4 = \iota_{\mathrm{s}}^*. \tag{7.6}$$

Now we show that Theorems 5.3 (iii) and 6.3 do not cover all possible situations in which supports of representing measures of the $\varkappa$th roots of Stieltjes moment sequences may be involved.

Example 7.5. Let $\varkappa = 2$. Set $\vartheta_1 = 1$, $\vartheta_2 = a^2$ and $\vartheta_3 = a^8$ with $a \in (1, \infty)$. Then $\alpha = \frac{1}{a^4}$, $\alpha^\dagger = \frac{1}{a^2}$, $\beta^\dagger = 1$, $\beta = a$ and $\gamma = a^4$. Set $a_n = (\alpha^n + \beta^n + \gamma^n)^2$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Clearly $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate Stieltjes moment sequences. We verify directly that $\operatorname{supp} \mu = \{\frac{1}{a^8}, \frac{1}{a^3}, 1, a^2, a^5, a^8\}$, $\mu((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)) = 0$, $\{\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \mu$, $\nu((\alpha, \beta)) = 0$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \nu$. Moreover, (7.6) is satisfied.

We conclude this section with an example of a Stieltjes moment sequence whose $\varkappa$th root is a Stieltjes moment sequence for $\varkappa = 2, 4$, but not for $\varkappa = 3$ (consult Corollary 6.4).

Example 7.6. Fix a real number $a > 1$. Set $\hat\alpha = a^{-33}$, $\hat\beta = 1$, $\hat\gamma = a^3$ and

$$a_n = (\hat\alpha^n + \hat\beta^n + \hat\gamma^n)^4, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

It is clear that $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[4]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate Stieltjes moment sequences whose representing measures have finite supports. We claim that $\{\sqrt[3]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is not a Stieltjes moment sequence.

For this, denote by μ and ν_4 the representing measures of Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[4]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$, respectively. By Theorem 3.3, we have

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu = \pi_4\big((\operatorname{supp}\nu_4)^4\big) = \pi_4\big(\{\hat\alpha, \hat\beta, \hat\gamma\}^4\big) = \{a^{3j-33i}\colon i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+,\, i+j \leqslant 4\}.$$

This implies that

$$\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) = 15. \tag{7.7}$$

Set $\vartheta_1 = \hat\alpha\hat\gamma^{\varkappa-1}$, $\vartheta_2 = \hat\beta^{\varkappa}$ and $\vartheta_3 = \hat\gamma^{\varkappa}$ with $\varkappa = 4$. Clearly $\vartheta_1 = a^{-24}$, $\vartheta_2 = 1$ and $\vartheta_3 = a^{12}$. Since $\operatorname{supp}\nu_4 = \{\hat\alpha, \hat\beta, \hat\gamma\}$, $\nu_4\big((\hat\alpha, \hat\beta)\big) = 0$ and $\hat\alpha\hat\gamma^3 < \hat\beta^4$, we infer from Theorem 5.1 that $\mu\big((\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)\big) = 0$, $\vartheta_3 = \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$.

Suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\{\sqrt[3]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence. Let ν_3 be its representing measure. In view of Corollary 3.4, $\operatorname{supp}\nu_3$ is finite. Hence, by Theorem 3.3, we have

$$\operatorname{supp}\mu = \pi_3\big((\operatorname{supp}\nu_3)^3\big). \tag{7.8}$$

Let α, β, γ, $\alpha^\dagger$ and $\beta^\dagger$ be as in (4.1) and (4.2) with $\varkappa = 3$. Then $\alpha = a^{-32}$, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = a^4$, $\alpha^\dagger = \beta^\dagger = a^{-8}$ and

$$\alpha\gamma < \alpha\gamma^2 = \vartheta_1 < 1. \tag{7.9}$$

By Theorem 5.3 (iii-a), $\nu_3\big((\alpha, \beta)\big) = 0$. It follows from Corollary 3.4 (iii) that $\gamma = \sup\operatorname{supp}\nu_3$. Applying Theorem 5.1, we deduce that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \operatorname{supp}\nu_3$. If $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\nu_3) = 3$, then $\operatorname{supp}\nu_3 = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, and by (7.8) we have $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) = 10$, which contradicts (7.7). The remaining possibility is that $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\nu_3) \geqslant 4$. Then there exists $x \in \operatorname{supp}\nu_3 \cap [(0, \alpha) \cup (\beta, \gamma)]$. We will show that $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) \geqslant 16$, again contradicting (7.7).

Consider first the case of $x \in (0, \alpha)$. If $\alpha = x\gamma$, then $x = a^{-36}$ and the sequence[4]

$$\{x^3, x^2\alpha, x\alpha^2, \alpha^3, x^2, x\alpha, x\alpha\gamma, \alpha^2\gamma, x, x\gamma, x\gamma^2, \alpha\gamma^2, 1, \gamma, \gamma^2, \gamma^3\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$$

is strictly increasing. If $\alpha < x\gamma$, then (7.9) implies that the sequence

$$\{x^3, x^2\alpha, x^2, x\alpha, x^2\gamma, x\alpha\gamma, x, \alpha, x\gamma, \alpha\gamma, x\gamma^2, \alpha\gamma^2, 1, \gamma, \gamma^2, \gamma^3\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$$

is strictly increasing as well. Finally, if $\alpha > x\gamma$, then, by (7.9) again, the sequence

$$\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{15} := \{x^3, x^2\alpha, x^2, x^2\gamma, x\alpha, x\alpha\gamma, x, x\gamma, x\gamma^2, \alpha\gamma, \alpha\gamma^2, 1, \gamma, \gamma^2, \gamma^3\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$$

is strictly increasing and $\xi_8 < \alpha < \xi_{10}$. If $\alpha \neq \xi_9$, then evidently $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) \geqslant 16$. Otherwise $x = a^{-40}$, and thus $\xi_6 < \alpha^2 < \xi_7$, which yields $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) \geqslant 16$.

Let now $x \in (\beta, \gamma)$. Then by (7.9) the sequence

$$\{\alpha^3, \alpha^2, x\alpha^2, \alpha^2\gamma, \alpha, x\alpha, x^2\alpha, x\alpha\gamma, \alpha\gamma^2, 1, x, x^2, x^3, x^2\gamma, x\gamma^2, \gamma^3\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$$

is strictly increasing. This completes the proof of our claim.

---

[4] We use (7.8) to justify that the terms of the sequences being considered are in $\operatorname{supp}\mu$.

8. Square roots

In this section, we concentrate on square roots of Stieltjes moment sequences which have representing measures supported in finite sets. For $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the following classes of Stieltjes moment sequences:

- $\mathfrak{S}_M$ stands for the set of all Stieltjes moment sequences having representing measures μ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mu \subseteq (0,\infty)$ and $\operatorname{card}(\operatorname{supp}\mu) = M$,
- $\mathfrak{S}_M^{1/2}$ stands for the set of all sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \in \mathfrak{S}_M$ such that $\{\sqrt{a_n}\,\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence,
- $\mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2}$ stands for the set of all $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \in \mathfrak{S}_M$ such that $\{\sqrt{a_n}\,\}_{n=0}^\infty \in \mathfrak{S}_N$.

By (2.1), any member of $\mathfrak{S}_M$ is determinate. It follows from Theorem 3.3 that

$$\mathfrak{S}_M^{1/2} = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2}. \tag{8.1}$$

We now describe all pairs (M,N) for which the classes $\mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2}$ are nonempty.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $M,N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent*:

(i) $\mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2} \neq \varnothing$,
(ii) $2N-1 \leqslant M \leqslant \binom{N+1}{2}$,
(iii) $\mathfrak{n}_-(M) \leqslant N \leqslant \mathfrak{n}_+(M)$,

where $\mathfrak{n}_-(M) = \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{8M+1}-1}{2} \right\rceil$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}_+(M) = \left\lfloor \frac{M+1}{2} \right\rfloor$. *Moreover, the following holds*:

(a) $\{\mathfrak{n}_-(M)\}_{M=1}^\infty$ *and* $\{\mathfrak{n}_+(M)\}_{M=1}^\infty$ *are monotonically increasing sequences,*
(b) *for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, exactly k terms of $\{\mathfrak{n}_-(M)\}_{M=1}^\infty$ are equal to k,*
(c) *for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, exactly 2 terms of $\{\mathfrak{n}_+(M)\}_{M=1}^\infty$ are equal to k.*

Proof. (i)⇒(ii) Take $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \in \mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2}$. Let μ and ν be as in (3.1) with $\varkappa = 2$. Then $\operatorname{supp}\nu = \{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_N\}$, where $0 < \xi_1 < \ldots < \xi_N$. First note that $2N-1 \leqslant M$. Indeed, this can be inferred from (3.3) and the following inequalities

$$\xi_1^2 < \xi_1\xi_2 < \xi_2^2 < \ldots < \xi_{N-1}^2 < \xi_{N-1}\xi_N < \xi_N^2.$$

Set $\varOmega_N = \big\{(k,l) \in J_N \times J_N \colon k \leqslant l\big\}$ with $J_N := \{1,\ldots,N\}$. By (3.3) the mapping $\varOmega_N \ni (i,j) \longmapsto \xi_i\xi_j \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$ is surjective, and thus $M \leqslant \operatorname{card}(\varOmega_N) = \binom{N+1}{2}$.

(ii)⇒(i) We shall prove that for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2N-1 \leqslant M \leqslant \binom{N+1}{2}$ there exists a sequence $\xi_1 < \ldots < \xi_N$ of positive real numbers such that[5] $\operatorname{card}\big(\{\xi_i\xi_j \colon i,j \in J_N\}\big) = M$. Once this is done, we see that $\big\{(\sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^n)^2\big\}_{n=0}^\infty \in \mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2}$.

We proceed by induction on N. The cases of $N=1$ and $N=2$ are easily seen to hold. Suppose that our claim is valid for a fixed integer N which is greater than or equal to 2. Take $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$2(N+1)-1 \leqslant M \leqslant \binom{N+2}{2}. \tag{8.2}$$

First we consider the case when

$$M \leqslant 3N. \tag{8.3}$$

---

[5] For simplicity, we write $\big\{\xi_i\xi_j \colon i,j \in J_N\big\}$ in place of $\big\{x \in \mathbb{R} \,|\, \exists i,j \in J_N \colon x = \xi_i\xi_j\big\}$.

It is clear that $k_0 := \binom{N+2}{2} - 2(N+1) \geqslant 0$ (because $N \geqslant 2$). Set $k = M - 2(N+1)$. It follows from (8.2) that $-1 \leqslant k \leqslant k_0$. From (8.3) we infer that $k+3 \leqslant N+1$. Fix $\xi_1 \in (0,\infty)$ and $t \in (1,\infty)$, and set $\xi_j = \xi_1 t^{k+j}$ for $j = 2, \ldots, N+1$. It is easily seen that the sets $\Xi_{N+1} := \{\xi_i\xi_j \colon i,j \in J_{N+1}\}$ and $\{\xi_1^2\} \cup \{\xi_1^2 t^i\}_{i=k+2}^{k+N+1} \cup \{\xi_1^2 t^i\}_{i=2k+4}^{2k+2(N+1)}$ coincide. Thus, since $k+3 \leqslant N+1$, we can arrange the elements of the set Ξ_{N+1} as follows

$$\xi_1^2 < \xi_1\xi_2 < \ldots < \xi_1\xi_{k+3} < \xi_2^2 < \xi_2\xi_3 < \xi_3^2 < \ldots < \xi_N^2 < \xi_N\xi_{N+1} < \xi_{N+1}^2.$$

Hence $\operatorname{card}(\Xi_{N+1}) = M$.

Now we consider the remaining possibility, namely that

$$M > 3N. \tag{8.4}$$

Set $M' = M - (N+1)$. Then by (8.2) we have

$$2N - 1 = 3N - (N+1) \overset{(8.4)}{<} M' \overset{(8.2)}{\leqslant} \binom{N+2}{2} - (N+1) = \binom{N+1}{2}.$$

By the induction hypothesis applied to M', there exists a sequence $\xi_2 < \ldots < \xi_{N+1}$ of positive real numbers such that $\operatorname{card}\big(\{\xi_i\xi_j \colon i,j = 2, \ldots, N+1\}\big) = M'$. Then there exists $\xi_1 \in (0, \xi_2)$ such that $\xi_1^2 < \xi_1\xi_2 < \ldots < \xi_1\xi_{N+1} < \xi_2^2$. Since $\xi_2^2 \leqslant \xi_i\xi_j$ for all $i,j = 2, \ldots, N+1$, we conclude that $\operatorname{card}\big(\{\xi_i\xi_j \colon i,j = 1, \ldots, N+1\}\big) = M' + N + 1 = M$. This completes the induction argument. Hence (i) is valid.

It is a matter of routine to show that the conditions (ii) and (iii) are equivalent. The assertions (a) and (c) are easily seen to hold, so we only explicitly prove (b). Set $M_k = \binom{k+1}{2}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $M_1 = 1$ and $M_{k+1} - M_k = k+1$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\mathfrak{n}_-(1) = 1$ and

$$\frac{\sqrt{8M_k + 1} - 1}{2} = \frac{(2k+1) - 1}{2} = k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M_k + 1 \leqslant M \leqslant M_{k+1}$, $\mathfrak{n}_-(M) = k+1$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Using assertions (a), (b) and (c) of Theorem 8.1, one can easily specify successive terms of the sequences $\{\mathfrak{n}_-(M)\}_{M=1}^\infty$ and $\{\mathfrak{n}_+(M)\}_{M=1}^\infty$. Below, we list the first fifteen terms of each of these sequences.

M	1	**2**	3	**4**	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	$\cdots$
$\mathfrak{n}_-(M)$	1	**2**	2	**3**	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	$\cdots$
$\mathfrak{n}_+(M)$	1	**1**	2	**2**	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	$\cdots$

Table 1

Applying (8.1) and Theorem 8.1 (see also Table 1), we get the following corollary.

Corollary 8.2. *If* $M \in \{2,4\}$, *then* $\mathfrak{S}_M^{1/2} = \varnothing$. *If* $M \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{2,4\}$, *then the set* $A_M := \{N \in \mathbb{N} \colon \mathfrak{n}_-(M) \leqslant N \leqslant \mathfrak{n}_+(M)\}$ *is nonempty,* $\mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2} \neq \varnothing$ *for every* $N \in A_M$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}_{M,N}^{1/2} = \varnothing$ *for every* $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus A_M$.

It is worth mentioning that the Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ constructed in Examples 7.3, 7.5 and 7.4 belong to the classes $\mathfrak{S}_{3,2}^{1/2}$, $\mathfrak{S}_{6,3}^{1/2}$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{9,4}^{1/2}$, respectively. According to Corollary 8.2, the square root of a Stieltjes moment sequence whose representing measure is concentrated on either a two point or a four point subset of $(0,\infty)$ is never a Stieltjes moment sequence. Hence, the following holds.

Corollary 8.3 ([**15**, Lemma 3.3])**.** *If α_1, α_2, ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 are positive real numbers, then the sequence $\big\{\sqrt{\alpha_1\vartheta_1^n + \alpha_2\vartheta_2^n}\big\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence if and only if $\vartheta_1 = \vartheta_2$.*

Let $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a Stieltjes moment sequence whose representing measure is concentrated on a three point subset of $(0,\infty)$. Then there exit $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \vartheta_3 \in (0,\infty)$ such that $\vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2 < \vartheta_3$ and $a_n = \alpha_1\vartheta_1^n + \alpha_2\vartheta_2^n + \alpha_3\vartheta_3^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Hence, in view of (8.1) and Corollary 8.2, the sequence $\{\sqrt{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence if and only if $\vartheta_2^2 = \vartheta_1\vartheta_3$ and $\alpha_2^2 = 4\alpha_1\alpha_3$.

9. Appendix

Here we present a proof of the implication (a)⇒(b) of Corollary 5.6 (iv) which is independent of Theorems 5.1 and 5.3. First, we state an auxiliary result.

Lemma 9.1. *If $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence with a representing measure μ supported in $[0,1]$, then $\lim_{k\to\infty} a_k = \mu(\{1\})$ and $\{a_n - \lim_{k\to\infty} a_k\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence.*

Proof. By Lebesgue's monotone convergence theorem, $\lim_{k\to\infty} a_k = \mu(\{1\})$, and thus $\{a_n - \lim_{k\to\infty} a_k\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence with a representing measure $\mu|_{[0,1)}$. □

Proof of implication (a)⇒(b) of Corollary 5.6 (iv). According to (2.1) and (2.2), the Stieltjes moment sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\,\}_{n=0}^\infty$ are determinate. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\vartheta_2 = 1$ (consider $\{\vartheta_2^{-n}a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ instead of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$). We infer from (2.2) applied to $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n})^{1/n} = 1. \tag{9.1}$$

By (2.2), $\operatorname{supp}\nu \subseteq [0,1]$. It follows from Lemma 9.1 that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} = \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})}$. Now, by Lemma 9.1 applied to $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$, we see that $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} - \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence. According to our assumption, $\{a_n - \mu(\{1\})\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a Stieltjes moment sequence with the representing measure $\mu_1 = \mu|_{[0,\vartheta_1]}$. Since $\vartheta_1 \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$, we get $\vartheta_1 = \sup\operatorname{supp}\mu_1$, which together with (2.2) leads to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big(a_n - \mu(\{1\})\big)^{1/n} = \vartheta_1. \tag{9.2}$$

By the mean value theorem, we have (recall that $a_n - \mu(\{1\}) \geqslant 0$ for all $n \geqslant 0$)

$$\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} - \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})} = \frac{a_n - \mu(\{1\})}{\varkappa\,\tau_n^{\frac{\varkappa-1}{\varkappa}}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots,$$

where τ_n is a real number such that $\mu(\{1\}) \leqslant \tau_n \leqslant a_n$. This implies that

$$\frac{a_n - \mu(\{1\})}{\varkappa\, a_n^{\frac{\varkappa-1}{\varkappa}}} \leqslant \sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} - \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})} \leqslant \frac{a_n - \mu(\{1\})}{\varkappa\mu(\{1\})^{\frac{\varkappa-1}{\varkappa}}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{9.3}$$

The conditions (9.1), (9.2) and (9.3) combined give

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big(\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} - \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})}\big)^{1/n} = \vartheta_1. \tag{9.4}$$

This together with (2.2) implies that a representing measure of the Stieltjes moment sequence $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} - \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is supported in $[0, \vartheta_1]$. Since

$$\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} = \big(\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n} - \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})}\big) + \sqrt[\varkappa]{\mu(\{1\})}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots,$$

we deduce from (9.4) and $\mu(\{1\}) > 0$ that the representing measure ν of $\{\sqrt[\varkappa]{a_n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is supported in $\big[0, \vartheta_1\big] \cup \{1\}$ and $\{\vartheta_1, 1\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \nu$. □

References

[1] N. I. Akhiezer, *The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis,* Hafner Publishing Co., New York 1965.

[2] G. Bennett, Lower bounds for matrices, II, *Can. J. Math.* **44** (1992), 54-74.

[3] C. Berg, J. P. Christensen, P. Ressel, *Harmonic analysis on semigroups*, Graduate Text in Mathematics **100**, Springer, Berlin 1984.

[4] B. Fuglede, The multidimensional moment problem, *Expo. Math.* **1** (1983), 47-65.

[5] P. R. Halmos, *Measure theory*, van Nostrand, Princeton 1956.

[6] R. A. Horn, On infinitely divisible matrices, kernels, and functions, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **8** (1967), 219-230.

[7] R. A. Horn, The theory of infinitely divisible matrices and kernels, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **136** (1969), 269-286.

[8] R. A. Horn, Infinitely divisible positive definite sequences, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **136** (1969), 287-303.

[9] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.

[10] B. E. Rhoades, Square roots for Hausdorff operators, *Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory* **11** (1988), 292-296.

[11] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1987.

[12] I. Schur, Bemerkungen zur Theorie der beschränkten Bilinearformenz mit unendlich vielen Veränderlichen, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **140** (1911), 1-29.

[13] J. A. Shohat, J. D. Tamarkin, *The problem of moments*, Math. Surveys **1**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 1943.

[14] B. Simon, The classical moment problem as a self-adjoint finite difference operator, *Advances in Mathematics* **137** (1998), 82-203.

[15] J. Stochel, J. B. Stochel, Seminormal composition operators on L^2 spaces induced by matrices: The Laplace density case, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **375** (2011), 1-7.

Instytut Matematyki, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, ul. Łojasiewicza 6, PL-30348 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: `Jan.Stochel@im.uj.edu.pl`

Faculty of Applied Mathematics, AGH University of Science and Technology, Al. Mickiewicza 30, PL-30059 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: `stochel@agh.edu.pl`